DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 944 HE 000 240

By-Gould, Samuel B.

The University and the State Government: Fears and Realities.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo.

Pub Date Nov 66

Note-24p.; Paper presented at 8th Annual College Self-Study Institute, University of California, Berkeley, July 11-14, 1966, "Campus and Capitol."

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.30

Descriptors-*Academic Freedom, Educational Responsibility, *Higher Education, Policy Formation, *Political Attitudes, *State Government, *State Universities

Unreserved public discussion of state government-university relations could result in straining and weakening the very elements the discussion was intended to strengthen. Subtle personal contacts, the essence of this relationship, are undefinable and differ in every instance even though they are the true means by which the balance of authority, responsibility and independence is maintained or upset. The first reality in the university's relationship with the state government is the degree of our faith in the democratic process and a belief in the elected representatives. A clear universal reality is the advocacy in political circles of an expanding system of higher education, a desire to know the facts and then act in light of them. Danger and problems arise when governmental questioning intrudes into areas of academic competence and judgment. Erosion of a university's independence can begin in matters that seem trivial at the time. Continuation of independence, therefore, depends on our readiness to recognize and defend those portions of academic and institutional life that are the university's sole responsibility to control. Any evaluation of state government-university relations should start with an examination of how well and in what formal terms this protection is provided. (Most academic fears center on this point.) Public universities should have basic freedom of action constitutionally guaranteed to them yet seek to create a climate of trust that will make recourse to legal defense unnecessary. An annotated bibliography is included. (JS)

ED 026944

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The University and State Government: Fears and Realities

by
Samuel B. Gould
President
State University of New York

HE 000 240

Unless my judgment is completely erroneous, this conference will be looked upon in retrospect as being unique in at least *one* way: it will be remembered more for what is *not* said than for what *is* said. Or, to qualify this statement somewhat, it will be remembered more for what is said in the corridors than from the platform. But then, perhaps this is not unique, after all; many of us can recall numerous conferences where this was so. The difference comes in the conference subject. The realistic circumstance here is that full and unreserved public discussion of the relations between a university and state government could have the effect of straining and weakening the very elements such a discussion is intended to strengthen. In addition, the whole subject is surrounded by a sense of fear and hesitancy that tends to becloud the realities.

I do not mean to give the impression by what I have just said that ultra-mysterious and darkly nefarious activities take place in university-state government relations. On the contrary, whatever does happen in the establishment of policies or the results of such policies is open and free to scrutinize. It would be illegal or unscrupulous to have it otherwise. But the more subtle personal contacts which are the warp and woof of the fabric of this relationship defy rules and definitions and formulas. They differ in

every single instance, even though they are the true means by which the delicate balance of authority, responsibility, and interdependence existing between the university and state government is maintained, or, when matters go awry, is upset. They represent the interplay of personalities, the development of attitudes on the part of these personalities reflecting a clear understanding of respective roles and motivations, and most of all the creation of a climate of mutual trust and respect.

Let me pause for a moment on this last point because I believe it to be extremely important, so important that without our agreement upon it the entire conference could degenerate into a study of artfully manipulative techniques. If such were indeed to be the case, it would be a major tragedy and a permanently lost opportunity.

Politicians and Educators: Differing Ways and Responsibilities

The first responsibility we have as educational administrators about to approach the process of dealing with the executive and legislative branches of state government is that of understanding, having sympathy for, and respecting the practical elements of political life. The ways of men elected to political office and the kinds of burdens they bear are not *our* ways or *our* burdens. They are part of the democratic pattern and they will always be present. Furthermore, they are necessary.

It is essential that we do not fall into the easy and dangerous trap of beginning our considerations of state government relationships from the premise that men in political office are crassly motivated, are intellectually inferior, and never rise above party loyalties. The stigma all too often attached to the term "politician" and the characteristics attributed to such a person, which have unfortunately become part of the mythology of our country, are generalizations unworthy of us all. We in the academic world have done little to counteract that stigma or to destroy that myth; indeed, we have oftentimes encouraged them. There are charlatans and hacks in political life, to be sure; there are charlatans and hacks in academic life as well, and we should look well and deeply into our own profession before we adopt a posture of superiority to any other.

I find that, in the main, people in the executive and legislative branches of state government are greatly concerned about the

welfare of their total constituencies, just as we are. They are hard-working men and women who emerge remarkably well from the effects of the multiplicity of pressures placed upon them by every segment of our society, including our own. They make mistakes just as we do; they are sometimes misled and misinformed like the rest of us. But the progress of most states, whether in health, social reforms, education, conservation of resources, transportation, and all the rest, is unmistakable to us all. And the executive and legislative leadership is the prime factor in this progress.

Whatever we, as educational leaders, intend to accomplish as our part in assisting the process of progress within our states can be done only with a full realization that government is bound to be involved in our efforts. Our task, therefore, is to develop personal relationships which make it possible for us to make clear to men in government the nature of our enterprise, the role we ourselves play, the portion of our institutional life and development which is not within the bailiwick of anyone else to prescribe or control or even touch, and most of all, the heavy responsibility resting upon *them* as well as upon *us* in fulfilling the education of our youth and, indeed, the total citizenry. It must be made equally clear that we and they have an unusual partnership in all this, the kind of partnership that gives to each side a specific set of assignments to be fulfilled in the interests of expanding and improving higher education.

The first reality in our relationship with state government is the degree of our own faith in the democratic process and our belief in those, regardless of party affiliation, who are the elected representatives of the people in promulgating that process.

New York State and the State University

In the course of examining a few more of the fears and realities of university-state government relationships, perhaps it would be helpful if I explained rather specifically the role of the governor and that of the legislature in New York as they pertain to the university. Such roles may differ in your own respective states, yet I should imagine there are basic similarities.

The State Executive and SUNY

The influence of the governor of New York upon educational and fiscal policy in public higher education is perhaps greater than any single force external to the university itself. He has the power,

first of all, to appoint all fifteen members of the Board of Trustees. It is possible that this power can be used to the detriment of the university. In actuality, however, the constructive way this power has been exercised is best evidenced by the strong, loyal, and dedicated service these good citizens perform in the interests of the university, all without any signs of political partisanship.

The governor's influence over the budget of the university and in the allocation of the state's tax resources to the many competing claims upon the budget is perhaps his most significant power. The budget director and his staff, acting in behalf of the governor, are in a constant and continuing year-round relationship to the university. This provides them with an opportunity to assess and evaluate our performance, to be sure, but it also affords us the equally important opportunity to orient them to the values, standards, needs, and aspirations of a university as these differ from those of regular government departments.

The university is required by statute to submit, every four years through the Board of Regents to the governor for his approval, a master plan covering the next ten years. It must also submit annual amendments to this plan. Here is an example of the governor's influence upon educational policy generally. This kind of power makes possible the virtual vetoing of specific programs for the creation of new institutions, the inauguration of new major academic programs, changes in orientation and emphasis, and the like. Another example of such influence is the governor's power to review (or later veto) legislation which the university wishes to introduce in the legislature. His willingness to give approval may help in a friendly legislature; his unwillingness may place the university in an awkward position in determining whether it should seek to introduce such legislation on its own behalf on the chance that he would not veto it once passed by the legislature. His endorsement in a hostile legislature may be fatal. In a divided legislature, which almost always demands compromise for any effective action, the degree to which he becomes active in behalf of the university is the determinant of success or failure.

The Legislature and SUNY

The influence of the legislature tends to be less well defined and less specific than that of the governor. With many members having generally shorter terms and being more subject to change, and

with much shorter periods of time annually in the state capitol, their powers, while concentrated during a session, give the impression of being less pervasive and continuing. They ordinarily initiate less than do governors.

Yet, their powers are great. They can give expanded authority; they can take it away. They can cut budgets; they can increase them. They can investigate and chart new paths of constructive legislative enactment; they can also investigate and destroy. They can reach into public higher education and force additions to the master plan; they can curtail enrollments; they can even create new professorial chairs on their own recognizance.

Even the simple recounting of executive and legislative power and influence is enough to raise many questions about what is to be feared or what is actual reality. There is no doubt that the university would have much to fear if it thought only of the legally designated powers which could be exerted upon it externally. But there is also no doubt that there are offsetting realities against which these fears can be placed and which give cause for at least a certain amount of optimism.

The Popular Position is to Expand Education

One of the all-encompassing realities is clear. Adherence to the advocacy of an expanding system of public higher education has now become one of the most popular positions in current political life. I am speaking of the situation in many states, not merely of New York. The tremendous surge in the numbers of college-age youth coupled with the ever-growing needs for trained manpower and retrained manpower has made political leaders aware more than ever before of the close relationship between a strong economy and a highly educated citizenry. Added to this are new realizations of what increased leisure time will mean in the future and how citizens must be prepared for this leisure, of what it means to have youth leave the state for want of adequate educational opportunity, and of what cultural responsibilities and opportunities are now coming to the forefront of community attention.

These developments combine to make a political platform in favor of expanded higher education most attractive to any candidate or any office incumbent. A flood of letters from constituents complaining because their sons and daughters can find no place

for themselves in the state's academic institutions, or a series of petitions from professional and technical groups pointing to shortages of skilled personnel and asking bluntly what training programs are in prospect to alleviate these shortages can soon sharpen the sensitivity of the legislator and stir his feeling of personal responsibility. Beyond this is the deep conviction held by many in public life that the true measure of our democracy is identified in our ability to educate to the limit of their potential all who are qualified.

Knowledge for Sound Judgments

We see a new set of attitudes emerging in many of our states, based upon a desire, first, to know the facts about higher education, and second, to do what appears appropriate in light of these facts. Governors are identifying themselves with the cause of higher education as never before. Legislatures are setting up joint committees of one sort or another backed up by permanent professional staffs in order to acquire full knowledge and to meet the problems of higher education with intelligent and careful judgment. Through such committees a university has an opportunity to be heard on major matters of public educational policy and to interpret its own needs and aspirations. With pressures for change and growth as they are today, unless a university seizes upon this opportunity, it will soon find legislative committees doing the interpretation themselves. (And, as an aside, may I say that when a university goes about interpreting its missions, it must do so in language understandable to the legislator, not in the academic jargon which sometimes fills our catalogues and other public pronouncements.)

Theoretically and ideally, I suppose one might take the position that universities should have none but the most nominal relationships with any bodies of state government. They should merely specify what they require and be given it with no questions asked. But such an ideal has rarely, if ever, existed anywhere, and it is certainly not likely to come into existence today. The very reverse is true. The huge amounts of money necessary for all of us to carry on make the governors and legislators and even the taxpayers all the more curious about how these monies are expended. And if all their curiosity concentrates upon the kind of stewardship of funds we maintain, or the safeguards we use to assure everyone that money is being used appropriately and economically, or the results of all this expenditure in terms of the quality of our academic results, there is no reason to complain. We are not such

a mysterious or esoteric priesthood that we cannot and should not provide such information willingly and even eagerly.

Who Makes the Judgments?

The problem and the danger begin to grow more acute, however, when the questioning of committees and governmental staffs reaches into areas of academic competence and scholarly judgment. Who is to decide, for example, what are the appropriate faculty-student ratios for instruction? Who is to decide the priorities by which a university is to achieve its various missions as they relate to intellectual life generally and to service needs of the state? Who is to make judgments about matters of academic freedom? Who is to determine where new campuses or institutions are to be situated? We could form a long list of such questions, but they all add up to the necessity for constant alertness on our part and unequivocal opposition when educational questions begin to be answered with political solutions.

The heart of the matter, therefore, is our readiness to recognize and defend what I defined earlier as "the portion of our institutional life and development which is not within the bailiwick of anyone else to prescribe or control or even touch." Any evaluation of state government-university relationships should start with an examination of how well and in what formal terms the protection of this portion of institutional life is provided. In repeating what I defined, let me emphasize the phrase "*in formal terms.*" If we have fears (and most of us do), they center upon this point.

Erosion of Institutional Independence

The erosion of the independence of a university can begin in what may seem rather trivial specifics at the moment of their occurrence. Each one of these probably touches upon some aspect of university independence incompletely understood by the external person or agency. In most instances, appropriate discussion and explanation may clear up the misunderstanding and cause rescinding of the action, but the vulnerability of the university remains. And if the action is not altered and the pressure withdrawn, a precedent has been set which can lead to similar actions as a regular pattern, actions which can gradually begin to deal with far less trivial matters. A complete and sympathetic understanding by *one* budget director does not guarantee a similar attitude on the part of the next; careful avoidance of dictation in academic

affairs by *one* legislative committee is no assurance of what the next will do. And no matter how assiduously we try to develop processes of orientation for newly appointed or elected officials, such processes are long and tedious, and much happens in the meantime.

Examples of Erosion at State Institutions

I could offer typical examples of the eroding specifics to which I am referring, and I am certain you have at least as many of your own that you could supply. Some tend to influence policy-making by boards of trustees; some reflect attempts at fiscal control that come close to directing decisions on academic activities and curricular change; some illustrate the seizure of initiative by a governmental agency in shaping the university's academic plans. All of them have elements of actual or potential danger, and we must be alert to what they could presage for the future.

Let me illustrate a few of these; even though they are presumably suppositious, as we would all like to feel, they *could* happen. Each represents the start of a tendency toward outside dictation which, if unchecked, could have anything but trivial consequences:

1. A legislator expounds in the public press his doubts about the wisdom of a university decision regarding the site of a new campus, giving unmistakable signs that he expects such a decision to take into account political considerations for the region rather than educational ones.
2. A directive (usually verbal) comes from a staff member in the executive chamber indicating that purchase of certain kinds of specialized equipment is to be cleared with him.
3. A legislative committee eliminates certain academic positions relating to a previously approved academic program on the grounds that their own judgment on the way the program is to be developed is the ruling one.
4. Funds for a minor week-end conference of staff or faculty are withheld on a pre-audit basis with the explanation that university personnel should pay their own expenses in such instances.
5. A legislator asks that a full disclosure be made by the university of the reasons why a particular faculty member has not received a renewal of his term appointment.

6. A committee is recommended to the legislature for the purpose of maintaining surveillance over students and faculty as to actions that might be interpreted as subversive because they reflect unpopular or unorthodox attitudes and opinions.

We could multiply such examples manyfold in their type and variety if we were to examine the experience of universities all over this country. They are becoming *more* prevalent rather than less.

Independent University or Public Agency?

Another element of erosion stems from the assumption by some state government executives and legislators that a public university is no more than another branch of state government, with exactly the same status as any government agency and therefore subject to exactly the same regulations. Indeed, the most difficult problem some of us may have is that of persuading state officials and the citizenry in general that it is absolutely essential that a university, if it is to be worthy of the name, is not at all the same as a government agency. And if it is forced to operate inflexibly under the rules of a government agency, it is doomed to sterility or worse.

This is not to urge for university authority and independence without responsibility. It is rather to recognize the differences between a university and state departmental agencies because of their differences in purpose and mission. It is to recognize the necessity for freeing the university from as many bureaucratic strictures as are feasible in order that it may take the appropriate initiative in developing and transforming itself to meet the needs of the times and the society it serves.

Have Universities Abdicated Initiative?

In the matter of establishing firmly where initiative for university development should originate, we of the academic world have already exhibited numerous forms of intellectual faithlessness and academic rationalization. Far too many grants from foundations eager to assist the progress of education have come about not because a university has thought through a new pattern or an innovative approach, but rather because foundation staff themselves have wanted to test certain theories. The university has many times accepted such assistance eagerly for prestige reasons and for the money itself. In the past few years the federal government has taken on the same role as the foundations with even greater temp-

tations to the universities, temptations to which we react in accordance with Oscar Wilde's famous dictum, namely, that "the only way to get rid of a temptation is to yield to it."

This is not to be critical of either the foundations or the federal government for their motives, which reflect a desire to do something better than it has been done. It is, rather, to point out that not enough initiative for such improvement seems to come from universities themselves, even when they know funds are possibly available. People removed from university life are doing the planning in very specific ways and are forcing the issues to conclusions which may or may not fit in with the institution's original objectives.

In recent months we have had another initiating agent introduced into the picture in the form of the new Compact of the States. Here is a new instrument heavily weighted on the governmental side, with excellent objectives in terms of gathering and disseminating information, but with another potentiality for transferring initiative rather subtly from the university itself. In addition to being a clearing-house for information, it will suggest what it feels are appropriate directions for higher education. We are assured that suggestions for policy change in higher education from this agency will be no *more* than suggestions, and I believe these assurances. But even suggestions from such a source will have great power and obvious pressure elements, and they will encourage even greater participation by state government in academic decision-making than we have experienced hitherto. Governors and legislators are far more the key figures in the Compact of the States than are representatives of public higher education, numerically or in any other way.

A great deal of this has happened and will continue to happen because we are traditionally laggard in our efforts toward establishing and maintaining a systematic planning process within our institutions. When we ourselves do not make assessments and evaluations and judgments and extrapolations for the future, when we ourselves do not take the time to examine our society and its needs and to determine where such needs impinge upon our own responsibilities, we can only expect that others will seize the initiative from us. Indeed, I have heard governmental officials say, as a paraphrase of the old saw about generals, that the educational future is too important to be left in the hands of educators. If this

is so, we have only ourselves to blame when we abdicate from any part of the responsibility for taking the initiative.

What I have been describing makes evident that this is not a simple problem to resolve. It also makes it clear that we should do well to re-examine our willingness to put all our faith and trust in the fact that our own particular situation may for the present be one of enjoying excellent mutual understanding and an uncomplicated partnership with state government. Some of us may think a sudden reversal of attitude is not probable or even possible. There is at least a reasonable likelihood, however, that we may be deluding ourselves.

The Need for Formal Guarantees

We have come to a time in the life of public higher education, I believe, when we should look carefully to the more formal, more legal safeguards to the independence of universities as our ultimate guarantee. Private institutions have such guarantees today by their very nature and much to their advantage. Furthermore, it is not mere coincidence that the very strongest of our state universities have their independence protected by clauses in their state constitutions. Autonomy may not assure academic excellence, but it most certainly is a major factor in providing the freedom of action that can lead more swiftly and surely to such excellence.

With the tendency of the times toward more and more interest in public higher education by the people and their duly elected and appointed representatives, and a corresponding tendency to introduce political considerations into the process of educational planning; with the growth in size of our institutions of learning, and their changing characteristics as a result of this growth requiring of them an ability and a freedom to make the most sweeping changes in every aspect of university life; with the enormous outlay of public funds for higher education, now and in the future, and therefore the mounting sense of vested interest by the public and governments; with more activist and vocal students and faculty on campus after campus calling attention to the academic world and causing increasing curiosity about what universities truly do and what they are supposed to be doing; with increasing pressures from business, industry, social agencies, or federal and state governments to shape the activities and curricula of the universities to their needs in research, training, and education and

to give such needs the very highest priority; with the increase in abrasive challenges and charges inevitably hurled by both sides in any disagreements over the missions of universities—with all these factors and others, constitutional guarantees of university independence of action appear not only desirable but essential.

The precise nature of these constitutional guarantees is bound to vary from state to state, as experience has already shown us. The clauses we read in the constitutions of Michigan, California, and Minnesota, for example, differ considerably. Yet they all tend to achieve the same goal; in so doing, they have brought enormous academic strength to their state universities. They are illustrative of a principle we should not ignore, namely, that legal safeguards to independence contribute to academic excellence.

We are prone to fall into the common error of believing that growth in size must carry with it more rigid controls and regulations and less flexibility of opportunity. Professor M. M. Chambers states this so well when he says, "Whether we think of institutions or of persons, the greatest mistake we can make is to believe that because we are becoming more numerous, we must inevitably lose some of our freedom. *The opposite is true.*"[1] The task for large institutions now becomes one of being organized in such a way physically and academically within the necessities of being large that even greater academic opportunities present themselves.

It should be pointed out also that having constitutional guarantees of freedom does not necessarily mean taking advantage immediately, or indeed at any time, of all the possibilities these guarantees provide. For example, if a university finds that its relations with a state purchasing agency or budget agency are such that it is having done for it efficiently, economically, and without interference all it requires, that university need not make any change in these regards. But it is important for all to know that if at some future time interference begins to be evident, the university has the constitutional power to make a change. It should have something to fall back on for its protection from any external actions that show signs of making inroads upon its essential freedom. Only in this way can it move forward with complete confidence.

It is in every way unthinkable that public universities of our country, founded in permanent and time-tested traditions of freedom going back for eight centuries, given the mission of producing graduates who will be informed rather than indoctrinated and who will be capable of rendering independent judgments, given the equally dominant mission of exploring the unknown with indefatigable zeal and without limitation—it is unthinkable, I say, that these public universities should be subject to the temporal vagaries which political relationships are bound to stimulate. It is equally unthinkable that universities should not recognize their inevitable involvement with political figures and governmental agencies, and that they should approach such involvement with anything but the highest sense of responsibility and the utmost candor in communication.

The process of orienting external agencies to a fuller knowledge of university affairs is one never to be abandoned or weakened in any way; it is, in fact, a most necessary facet of university development. But all such orientation must be founded upon certain permanent strengths provided legally and guaranteeing the opportunity for universities to achieve greatness through independence and freedom of action in areas which are clearly reserved to them alone. Otherwise, we shall be allowing and even encouraging the fluctuations of fortune which personalities and events can bring about from time to time.

This, then, is the essence of my comments: that the public universities of today and tomorrow should have their basic freedom of action guaranteed to them by constitutional authority; that they should use their power under such authority only when necessary as a protection; and that they should deal responsibly, perceptively, and realistically with all elements of state government, seeking thereby to create a climate of understanding and trust which will make recourse to legal defenses unnecessary in all but the most extraordinary circumstances.

---

[1]M. M. Chambers, *Freedom and Repression in Higher Education* (Bloomington, Indiana: Bloomcraft Press, 1965), p. 120.

See Section I in the back of this book for annotated bibliography of related materials.

Precis

The University and State Government:

Fears and Realities

The realistic circumstance here is that full and unreserved public discussion of the relations between a university and state government could have the effect of straining and weakening the very elements such a discussion is intended to strengthen. The more subtle personal contacts which are the warp and woof of the fabric of this relationship defy rules and definitions and formulas. They differ in every single instance, even though they are the true means by which the delicate balance of authority, responsibility, and interdependence existing between the university and state government is maintained, or, when matters go awry, is upset.

The first reality in our relationship with state government is the degree of our own faith in the democratic process and our belief in those, regardless of party affiliation, who are the elected representatives of the people in promulgating that process.

An all-encompassing reality is clear. Adherence to the advocacy of an expanding system of public higher education has now become one of the most popular positions in current political life. A new set of attitudes is emerging in many of our states, based upon a desire, first, to know the facts about higher education, and second, to do what appears appropriate in light of these facts. The problem and danger, however, occur when the questioning of committees and governmental staffs reaches into areas of academic competence and scholarly judgment.

The erosion of the independence of a university can begin in what may seem rather trivial specifics at the moment of their occurrence. The heart of the matter, therefore, is our readiness to recognize and defend the portion of our institutional life and development which is not within the bailiwick of anyone else to prescribe or control or even touch. Any evaluation of state government-university relationships should start with an examination of how well and in what formal terms the protection of this portion of institutional life is provided. If we have fears, and most of us do, they center upon this point.

The public universities of today and tomorrow, then, should have their basic freedom of action guaranteed to them by constitutional authority, yet seek to create a climate of understanding and trust which will make recourse to legal defenses unnecessary in all but the most extraordinary circumstances.

Section I

The University and State Government: Fears and Realities

Allen, H. K. *Finance and State Institutions of Higher Education in the United States.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. 181 pp.

Written directly after W.W. II influx in our higher education enrollment, the book is concerned with new ways for states to obtain the necessary revenue to maintain their educational systems. After analyzing present state tax structures the only hope is seen in establishing a broad based retail sales tax and a moderately progressive income tax.

Blackwell, Thomas E. *College Law: A Guide for Administrators.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1961. 347 pp.

Although the book covers an extensive amount of material, chapters VII and VIII are of primary importance. Blackwell is able to put many of the questions such as "Is education a function of government?" and "Are some state universities constitutionally independent corporations?" into a concise, logical perspective. His discussion of certain state officials' interference with the internal administration of institutions of higher education, i.e., state administration agencies, state auditors, and state treasurers, is very illuminating.

————. "Legislative Control of Tax Supported Universities," *College and University Business,* Vol. XXVI (September, 1956), pp. 34-35.

The author argues that the majority of state supported colleges and universities are now considered to be public corporations created by the state legislature and subject to their control.

Browne, Arthur D. "The Institution and the System: Autonomy and Coordination," *Long-Range Planning in Higher Education,* Owen A. Knorr, Ed. Boulder, Colo.: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1964, pp. 39-51.

The case of autonomy versus coordination as applied to long-range planning is presented. The evidence points to a split decision, with each a winner if it is willing to pay a price. But the cost of winning is high, for it involves restraint and sacrifice, which means the subjugation of personal interests to the welfare of the total educational enterprise.

Brumbaugh, A. J. "Proper Relationships Between State Government and State-Supported Higher Institutions," *Educational Record*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (July, 1961), pp. 173-178.

Forces encroaching on institutional autonomy are identified. The factors contributing to the trend toward external controls of state colleges and universities are discussed. The author offers five conclusions concerning the relationships between the state and its institutions of higher education.

———. *State-Wide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education*. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963. 45 pp.

This book represents a concise and short summary of the requirements for an effective state-wide planning and coordination agency. Several states are used as guidelines in describing the operation and functions of state planning boards. The author feels such an independent agency is needed in order to bring together the common objectives of both the citizens and the institutions of higher learning.

Campbell, Roald F. and Gerald R. Sroufe. "Toward a Rationale for Federal-State-Local Relations in Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. XLVII, No. 1 (September, 1965), pp. 2-7.

The increasing activity of the federal government in education demands examination and if possible the development of a rationale which would suggest the nature of an appropriate partnership among federal, state, and local governments as they relate to education. The thesis follows: (1) the present situation is confused; (2) ours was a national federalism from the beginning; (3) there has been a gradual shift toward increased national federalism; (4) national federalism is a basis for viewing recent policy developments in higher education; and (5) a rationale for policy-sharing among national, state, and local governments is needed.

Chambers, M. M. *Freedom and Repression in Higher Education*. Bloomington, Indiana: The Bloomcraft Press, Inc., 1965. 126 pp.

In the author's words he has "struggled to explain and present favorably the principle of individual freedom of choice and of institutional autonomy in higher education . . ." which to him are more important than centralized planning and administrative bureaucracy. Dr. Conant's book, *Shaping Educational Policy*, is heavily criticized on the grounds that Chambers feels diversity rather than unity ". . . is needed in a state's higher education policy and at all costs our systems of higher education should steer away from any uniformity or regimentation of a bureaucratic nature."

———. *Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan, 1961. 80 pp.

The author continues his theme of non-compulsory planning and administering of state higher education in the hands of a formal

agency. He asks some pointed questions as to the real benefit such organizations actually provide. He feels that "neither at the state level nor the national level do Americans want a rigidly structured 'European ministry of education' type of control of public colleges and universities." He analyzes in separate chapters the systems of higher education in California, Colorado, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan.

The Committee on Government and Higher Education. *The Efficiency of Freedom*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959. 44 pp.

This study, financed by The Fund for the Advancement of Education, has as its objectives: (1)to define the relationships that should properly exist between public officials and state institutions of higher education; (2) to identify the principal areas in which state control over higher education has appeared to exceed proper limits and thus to lead to unwarranted political or bureaucratic intrusion into educational policy or effective educational administration; and (3) to suggest basic remedial lines of action.

Coons, Arthur G. and others. *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975*. Sacramento, Calif.: California State Department of Education, 1960. 230 pp.

This volume, as prepared for the Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the California State Board of Education, forms a comprehensive analysis and projection of the state needs in higher education for a fifteen-year period. Includes index, tables, and appendices.

Coordinating Two-Year Colleges in State Education Systems. A Report of a Conference in Washington, D. C., May 16-17, 1957. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957.

The role of the state directors and supervisors of two-year colleges in coordinating these institutions in a state educational system is identified. Brief descriptions are included of the organization and scheme for operation and control of two-year institutions in sixteen states.

DeZonia, Robert H. "Coordination Among Higher Institutions in Wisconsin," *Educational Record*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (July, 1963), pp. 288-293.

The author presents a brief overview and analysis of the coordinating committee for higher education in Wisconsin. Although the committee has created certain frictions within the state, the author feels that it has contributed significantly to the advancement of higher education.

"Freedom Crusade of the University of Massachusetts," *Educational Record*, Vol. XXXVIII (April, 1957), pp. 100-111.

An account, through the use of documents and press clippings, of

how the university regained control of its personnel policies through a hard-fought campaign for public support led by the president. Offers a good look at a case study on how university officials can maintain local autonomy and control of university policies.

Glenny, Lyman A. *Autonomy of Public Colleges.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959. 325 pp.

The author in this work presents a comprehensive description of the existing patterns of coordination in higher education within states until 1957. Through a process of extensive personal interviewing of governors, college presidents, legislators, and state and university administrative officers, the author is able to present a picture of the various coordinating agencies and boards throughout the United States. The book therefore attempts to enable legislators and educators to have a better understanding of what type of coordinating relationship within their state can best achieve a higher quality of higher education while not sacrificing such concepts as autonomy and freedom.

————. "State Systems and Plans for Higher Education," *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education.* Logan Wilson, Ed. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965. pp. 86-103.

"Diversity continues to be cherished and encouraged by all, but today the unlimited freedom of a college or university to pursue a self-determined destiny is rapidly being curtailed among the public institutions and even has prospects of diminishing among the non-public ones. At the state level the new watchwords are cooperation and coordination, with institutional autonomy only within certain new perimeters. The classic condition of autonomy in higher education still prevails in only ten states . . . ."

Green, Ralph T. "The Need for Coordination and Controls in the Financing of State Institutions," *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Conference of the National Tax Association, 1962.* Harrisburg, Pa.: National Tax Association, 1963, pp. 476-82.

The author suggests that financial requests for institutions of higher education be handled and controlled through a coordinating board which then presents recommendations to the legislature. He contends that the legislative committees have neither the time nor ability to handle the volumes of factual material that support requests, and are unable to truly differentiate between institutions.

Harris, Seymour E. *Challenge and Change in American Education.* Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1965. 346 pp.

Second in a series of three books edited by Seymour Harris based on the Seminars in American Education at Harvard University between 1958-1963. Three broad topics are presented: "Government and Education"; "Challenges in Educational Planning"; "Management."

———————. *More Resources for Education*: The John Dewey Society Annual Lecture, February 12, 1960. New York: Harper and Bros., 1960. 85 pp.

It is shown that expenditures in all levels of education have not kept pace with the use in other levels of expenditures by all levels of our government. Higher education is by far the more complex problem in education than lower and will require more than just additional money. New mechanisms of finance as well as a redistribution of emphasis from local support to federal must come about in order to alleviate the tremendous burden placed on local and state governments.

Henderson, Algo. "The Role of the State in Higher Education," *Educational Record*, Vol. XXXII (January, 1951), pp. 64-69.

The author identifies four functions of the state in the field of higher education: (1) assures for youth equality of opportunity in education; (2) fosters the development of the resources of a country, with higher education as a means of developing the human resources; (3) assures the facilities in higher education are significant to meet the needs and that the programs are of adequate quality; and (4) stimulates research and supports research programs of its own.

Hill, W. W., Jr. "State Supported Student Loan Programs," *Proceedings, 55th Annual Conference of the National Tax Association, 1962*. Harrisburg, Pa.: National Tax Association, 1963. pp. 493-501.

Author indicates that soon, 25 percent of all college students may be borrowing money for college expenses and up to 10 percent of all college expenses may be met by loans. A director of one of the nation's largest private college loan companies, he urges local, state, and voluntary efforts in the area and argues against government involvement on a massive scale.

Horner, Harlan E. "The State and Higher Education," *University of the State of New York Bulletin*. Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, April 15, 1939. pp. 5-35.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. *A Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois*. Springfield, Illinois: Board of Higher Education, July, 1964. 72 pp.

The plan is a comprehensive study of educational needs in public and non-public colleges and universities and other educational enterprises. It looks at questions such as how should public colleges and universities be governed? What structure is to be provided for the most economical operation? To what extent is unified planning and coordination useful? To what extent should non-public institutions be involved in state-wide planning? Chapter 6 on financing and chapter 7 on organization and coordination are of special worth.

Martorana, S. V. and Ernest V. Hollis. *State Boards Responsible for Higher Education*. Office of Education, U. S. Department

of Health, Education, and Welfare, Circular No. 619. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960. 254 pp.

Although dated, this volume is still an important study in the coordination of institutions of higher education. It is organized with a broad overview, analysis, and evaluation of state boards; a state-by-state analysis of the organization of public higher education in the United States; and a number of basic reference tables pertaining to state organization. Includes an appendix on the "Allocation of Operating Funds by Boards for Higher Education" authored by A. J. Brumbaugh and Myron R. Blee.

McConnell, T. R. "The Coordination of State Systems of Higher Education," *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education*, Logan Wilson, Ed. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965, pp. 129-141.

The author gives comprehensive coverage to the development and forms of the various state systems of coordination and cooperation in higher education. Areas covered include: Voluntary Systems; The Single Board; The Coordinating Board; Coordinated Planning; and Major Trends in Coordination. Includes select bibliography.

———. *A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education*. Sacramento, Calif.: California State Department of Education, 1955. 473 pp.

As prepared for the Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the California State Board of Education, this volume supplemented and replaced the original study of the needs of higher education in the state completed in 1948. Included in this extensive state study are: The Needs for Higher Education in California, as measured by the population to be served; The Functions and Programs of Higher Education in California; The Government, Administration, and Coordination of Public Higher Education; The Present Physical Plants and Future Plants Needed; and California's Ability to Support Higher Education.

Miller, James L., Jr. "The Two Dimensions of State-Wide Higher Education Coordination," *Educational Record*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (April, 1962), pp. 163-167.

The author briefly describes different types of state coordination and coordinating bodies, but the primary concern is with the dimensions of coordination. The first is geographic coordination termed horizontal due to its concern for providing equal educational opportunities across a state; the second is program coordination termed vertical because it concerns itself with research and the pyramid of educational programs. Although effective coordination is not assured by a formal state organization, the author believes that more and more states are going to adopt some form of formal organization in the future.

Millet, J. D. "State Planning for Higher Education," *Educational Record*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (Summer, 1965), pp. 223-30.

Miller, a professor of public administration, aptly deals with the topic of state planning which he feels must be established so that in the political process of taxation, borrowing, and spending higher education planning can present its needs comprehensively and justify its objectives reasonably. Relationship of planning agency and the institution along with the content of a state master plan are discussed.

Muir, Malcolm and Frances E. Rourke. *The Campus and the State*. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959. 414 pp.

A study of the challenge and response in the day-to-day relationships between public institutions of higher education and American state governments. The authors believe that the trend toward administrative centralization within the states has been a major factor in introducing greater stress into relations between public colleges and universities and state government.

Morey, Lloyd. "Governmental Control of Public Higher Education," *Transactions and Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities*, Vol. LIII (1957), pp. 30-41.

The author maintains that a state institution of higher education, as a part of the state, and receiving its main support from the state, should and does have responsibility and accountability to the government and, through it, to the public.

Morrison, D. G. and S. V. Martorana. *Criteria for the Establishment of Two-Year Colleges*. Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962. 70 pp.

Examines the various formulas and patterns of support for two-year colleges and reviews the proportion of this support which is received from the state, from the district, and from student sources. Six questions relating to financing the two-year colleges are posed with brief comments.

Mushkin, Selma J. and Eugene P. McLoone. *Public Spending for Higher Education in 1970*. Chicago, Ill.: Council of State Governments, February, 1963. 60 pp.

As part of Project '70', a series of studies of state revenues and expenditures projected to 1970, this publication is concerned with questions raised if higher education needs are to be met in 1970. Contending that this probably is the fastest growing area of state expenditures during the coming five years, the authors look at present figures and, assuming certain economic and demographic conditions, project the necessities of 1970, and the amount of additional tax support required. Includes appendices showing statistics on a state-by-state breakdown.

_____. "State Financing of Higher Education," *Economics of Higher Education*. Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962, pp. 216-249.

A comprehensive review of the ways and means state governments are using to meet their threefold responsibilities for higher education: (1) to answer educational opportunities for growing number of qualified students; (2) to develop manpower capabilities in numbers adequate to supply vital public services; and (3) to build higher educational potential so necessary to economic progress in the state.

Nevins, Allan. *The State University and Democracy*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1962. 171 pp.

An historical work on the four stages of development in our state and land-grant institutions, with special attention to their contributions to democracy. Current trends in enrollment, academic curriculum, and structure of public and private institutions. Of special note is chapter 4 on future trends.

Pierce, Truman M. *Federal, State and Local Government in Education*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964. 120 pp.

Viewpoint throughout the book is that education under the auspices of government has both reflected and strengthened concepts of individual freedom and opportunity. Issues such as control, goals, financing, and church and state are each discussed in regard to the role each branch of government will play in determining these issues. Bibliography, pp. 113-114.

Reeves, H. C. "Higher Education and State Tax Policy," *National Tax Journal*, Vol. 291 (1962), pp. 291-296.

Starting with the premise that responsibility for providing a basic program of higher education lies with the state, the author proposes that states should allow tax credits for general purpose contributions to private colleges and universities. The state corporation income tax is suggested as the best vehicle to implement this kind of policy and would provide those in high income brackets with an attractive alternative to other donations. The proposal voices a genuine concern for the maintaining of voluntary support for private higher education.

Reports on Higher Education. An Annotated Bibliography of Recent Reports of State Study Commissions and Other Official Agencies. Chicago, Ill.: The Council of State Governments, March, 1958. 15 pp. (Mimeographed)

An annotated bibliography of seventeen official state reports on higher education. The annotations include the major subjects covered in each report and a summary of the recommendations.

Sliger, B. F. and Thomas R. Beard. "State Support of Public Higher Education," *Proceedings, 55th Annual Conference of the National Tax Association, 1962*. Harrisburg, Pa.: National Tax Association, 1963, pp. 464-76.

In answering the questions (1) how much should be spent on higher education, and (2) how much of the responsibility will fall upon state-supported—as opposed to private institutions of higher learning,

the authors discuss state support in terms of: Higher Education and Optimum Resource Allocation; Needs and Means of State-Supported Higher Education; The Role of the States in Public Higher Education; and State Support vs. Higher Tuitions.

Smylie, R. E. "Legislative Workshops—A Method of Improving Communication with Higher Education," *State Government,* Vol. 32 (1959), pp. 266-271.

Governor Smylie of Idaho, in this speech given to the Western Governors' Conference in 1959, ably expresses the need for legislators, state officials, and educators of their regions to jointly examine the needs of higher education. His analysis of the western states' problems in higher education are accurate and concise. Smylie specifically describes the contrasting motives and concerns of legislators and educators.

Strand, A. L. "Land-Grant Colleges and the State," *Proceedings of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities,* Vol. 67 (1953), pp. 221-225.

Report of a survey of 47 land grant colleges from 46 states and one territory identifying the controls over the colleges which become operative after the legislative appropriations to the institutions have been made.

The University of the State of New York, State Education Department. *The Regents' State-wide Plan for the Expansion and Development of Higher Education, 1964.* Albany, N. Y.: The University of the State of New York Press, April, 1965. 131 pp.

Every four years the State Board of Regents must submit a comprehensive plan for the orderly development of higher education. This is their first plan. The report is an extensive document covering every aspect of education and the peculiar organization and relationship of New York public and private schools. Report deals at length with the state needs—both the state and the society. Part IV deals with the institution plans and the means of the master plan to achieve identity, unity, and excellence throughout the university.

"What About Services of State Departments of Education?" *Bulletin of the Bureau of School Services.* Lexington, Kentucky: College of Education, University of Kentucky, June, 1955.

Eight critical requirements, expressed in terms of abilities of staff members, are listed as influencing the effective performance of services.

Wilson, Logan, Ed. *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education.* A collection of essays. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965. 292 pp.

This volume of essays is contributed by the nation's leading educators and scholars; it is a comprehensive overview of American higher education today. Directed primarily at organization and direction,

it covers: the changing environment of higher education; institutional modifications; the emergence of state systems; voluntary arrangements; interinstitutional and interstate agreements; unified approaches to national problems; national associations in higher education; and national policy for higher education: problems and prospects. Primary emphasis is toward the emergence of a stronger national higher educational policy.

Wooden, William P. "State Universities—Legislative Control of a Constitutional Corporation," *Michigan Law Review,* Vol. 55, No. 5 (March, 1957), pp. 728-730.

Article reviews the decision of the Utah Supreme Court on the issue of whether or not a university corporation is free from any control by the state. The court found that such a corporation, i.e., Michigan, California, and Colorado, is merely an independent province and, as such, legislative enactments will prevail over the rules and regulations made by the university where the matter in question is not an exclusively university affair . . . . Of special interest with regard to the influence of the state government to the campus is the legislative control of the university when "conditions are attached to university appropriations."

Some of the annotated listings in this section have been reproduced from *Selected Issues in Higher Education; An Annotated Bibliography* with the permission of Teachers College Press, Columbia University.